

9/16/68

Dear Phil,

Thanks for calling me friend ^{Phil} for for your thoroughly enjoyable letter of 9/14;

I'll read the poem when I can concentrate. As you know by now, I had formed certain impressions of Martin McAuliffe that are consistent with what you say. I believe him, which, I think, he indicated Garrison didn't (and I suspect he could be right, though I do not know). I also think there are some things he can do that could help what I want to accomplish for us all. Perhaps some day I'll be able to ask him, when he may be able to consider it.

First, unless I said something I didn't intend, let me assure you my reference to "Randy" was intended other than you took it. You asked me to get something from her, if she would. I had already discussed this with her. I think what I had in mind is the confession that I ~~hadn't~~ not had time. I've travelled quite a bit (though not as much straight up and down and side to side!) since I saw you and have written much. For my own purposes, I still want to do this, for tiny clues are sometimes very important, and contemporaneous writing often holds them. My own attitude is that the past is but prologue. Especially in such matters.

Omaha is a strange place for ~~some~~ many people to come from or be in or near. Should not a poet have a better explanation than a non-fictioner?

On Harber, why not, if you haven't, just phone and ask if you might see him in the near future, learn if he is the guy and is willing? I'll send you what I can as soon as I can. I'm seeing a colleague who knows more and may have a picture tomorrow evening.

Alan Courtney's name first came to my attention some time ago in reading some FBI reports. In this case, you cannot imagine how intellectually exciting that can be, because they are all do-able-talk. The problem is decided what they really say, what they misrepresent, omit, or just deliberately say backward. I have met no one who knows him, and it suddenly struck me that perhaps, having essentially the same philosophy, he might be otherwise related to Kent. My major interest in Si, at the moment, has to do with an aspect of the case - have never discussed with you, whether he has part of the files of a deceased character much more extreme than he, Guy Banister. Alan tied in with the Harber past, but how I do not really know.

If I have a Harber picture, it will take more time to get a print made than if my colleague has one. If he has anything that can be helpful, he may send it directly. I'll ask him to, because it should save several days.

I've just noticed your reference to Martin again. I think your letter helped, but I also think he'd have seen me without it. I think he is an interested man and would have in any event wanted to know what I wanted to know and perhaps what he might know the meaning of which he didn't understand. He may also have had a clinical interest in one with my reputation!

Right now I've no time to bring you up to date on what I've written and been doing. ~~Some~~ Some day, with a half hour or so when there isn't time to start something new. I shall. Until then or my hearing from you again, best regards.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg